REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-18, and 20-89 are pending in the present application, of which claims 32-85 have been withdrawn. Claims 1, 14, and 21 are independent. Claims 1-4, 6-18, 20-31, and 86-89 have been rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-4, 6-18, 20-31, and 86-89 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobsen et al. (U.S. 6,232,937) in view of Helms (U.S. 5,952,992). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The present application is directed towards a method and a system of writing an image on a liquid crystal display by selecting a light source for illuminating the display based on a detected ambient light setting, writing the image to the display and flashing the selected light source to illuminate the display. The brightness of the selected light source is adjusted based on the ambient light level. The color of the selected light source may also depend on the ambient brightness level. For example, a "night" light source may be either a red LED or a blue green LED. While red is typically considered better for maintaining a person's night vision, the red light is more detectable using night detection gear. (*See* Specification, p. 22, l. 16 - p. 23, l. 9.)

Jacobsen discusses a method that writes an image to a display with a plurality of pixel electrodes, and flashes a light source to illuminate the display. The current to the light source can be varied by a user to adjust the intensity of the color of the light source. However, Jacobsen does not teach or suggest automatically selecting a light source based on the ambient brightness level.

Helms is directed at automatically adjusting the brightness level of an LCD based on the ambient lighting conditions. While the Examiner cites Helms in combination with Jacobsen, no discussion is made about which elements of the present claims may be found in Helms. Nowhere does Helms mention selecting a particular light source, nor is there any reference to multiple light sources.

Neither Jacobsen nor Helms, nor their combination, teach or suggest selecting a light source based on the detected ambient light setting. While Jacobsen's display may allow a user to vary the intensity of the light source based on the ambient level perceived by the user, and Helms

may vary the brightness level of an LCD based on the ambient lighting conditions, that is not the same as the Applicants' feedback mechanism that selects both an appropriate light source and adjusts its brightness based on the ambient light level. Therefore, independent Claims 1, 14, and 21 are not obvious in view of the combination of Jacobsen and Helms and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-4, 6-13, 15-18, 20, 22-31, and 86-89 depend on the independent Claims 1, 14, and 21, respectively, and, therefore, are patentable in view of the combination of Jacobsen and Helms for at least the same reasons as above. All claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Although the claims have been amended, the Applicants are not acquiescing to the rejections. In particular, Jacobsen can be removed as a reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c). The Applicants therefore reserve the right to seek the rejected claims in a continuation application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (978) 341-0036.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By _____

Rodney D. Johnson
Registration No. 36,558
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: March 15, 2004